UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/506,431 | 09/02/2004 | Seung Myun Baek | 7950.032.00-US | 1279 |

30827 7590 09/18/2007

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| CHEN, YAN LU |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2146 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 09/18/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/506,431 | BAEK ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Yan Chen | 2109 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *7/17/2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-4* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-4* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 120 640 A2 (hereinafter EP '640), and further in view of Mostafa et al. (US 5949779).

Regarding claim 1,

EP '640 teaches: A method for identifying multiple home networks each having a plurality of home appliances (page 4, lines 20-21: number of electrical appliances. See figure 1, elements 6, 7 and 9) connected to respective adapters (page 4, lines 22-23: each appliance has an associated interface unit. Figure 1, element 6') and a network controller (page 4, line 24. Figure 1, element 12), and at least two home networks share one communication line (page 4, line 17: electrical main supply. Figure 1, element 1), the method comprising the steps of:

setting a house code to each of adapters (house code for each of the adapters are taught in page 5, lines 11-12 as code of the house and code of the device) to the home appliances for identifying home networks;

receiving a packet (page 4 line 25: control signals) including the house code (page 5, lines 1-14: the house code and device code are element of the control signal stream) on the communication line at the adapters (pages 5-6: signal received at the interface/detector), and comparing a preset house code to the house code included in the packet (pages 5-6: microprocessor in the interface act as a detector and decode the signals and a comparison is made between the signal's house code); and

one of the adapters understanding that the packet is directed to the one of the adapters if the two house codes are in conformity as a result of the comparison, and transferring the packet to one of the home appliances connected thereto (page 6, lines 16-27: if the codes correspond then the microprocessor in the interface will take appropriate action for the intend appliance to perform the requested task).

EP '640 teaches setting of house code for the adapter (page 5, lines 11-12). EP '640 also teaches that the master controller (abstract: i.e. house control managing site) that connects all of the house network controller and have the functionality of managing and generating the house code for individual connected houses (page 7, lines 6-12).

EP'640 differ from the claim invention in that the setting of the house code is not by providing the serial number of the adapter to the network controller, nor specify the details description of the master controller; particularly that it is located on the Internet.

Mostafa et al. teaches the step of setting a house code having the step of;

putting a house code setting program (abstract: Consumer Electronic Bus (CEBus) network protocol) into operation in the network controller (network controller is taught in the abstract as CEBus network. See figure 3, element 330),

providing a serial number of the adapter (adapter is taught column 3, line 29-45 as being utility-managed settable nodes (UMSN) or CEBus node. The serial number of the adapter is taught in column 7 lines 60-62 as a device address or MAC address) and making access to a house code managing site on the Internet (column 5, lines 22-33) in the program (CEBus network communicates with utility server controller (UHMN) via Internet protocols for house code is taught in the abstract and columns 5, 7-8),

receiving an own house code assigned from the house code managing site and transferring to a relevant adapter (Column 7, lines 66-67 and column 8, lines 1-11 teach that CEBus nodes (devices) request for a unique device address (house code) and the respective CEBus network obtain it from the UHMN (house code management site). column 8, lines 45-58: the CEBUS network/network controller receives a unique address/house code and assigned to the respective UMSN/adapter.), and the adapter storing the house code to a relevant memory region (column 7, lines 54-57: CEBus node/adapter acquires a house code and stored in a memory).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used EP '640's data distribution network to incorporate the network controller of Mostafa et al. to obtain a house code for the adapter from a centralized server over the internet, since the centralized server is accessible by the individual

home network and the server can also maintain the distribution of house codes to each individual devices to guarantee consistency and ID uniqueness. Providing the network controller with the adapter's serial number (MAC address) in the system of EP '640, as modified above to obtain house code for the adapter from a centralized server, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, because Mostafa et al. teach that associating a house code with the adapter's MAC address creates the ease of identification of the house code to the related adapter.

Regarding claim 3,

EP '640 and Mostafa et al. teach the limitations of claim 1 for the reasons above.

EP '640 differs from the claimed invention in that it did not indicate the serial number of the adapter are provided to the network controller and that the network controller access the internet.

Mostafa et al. teaches the step of providing a serial number of the adapter (serial number of the adapter is taught in column 7 lines 60-62 as a device/MAC address) and making access to a house code managing site on the Internet in the program includes the step of making an automatic access to the house code managing site once the serial number for the adapter is provided (CEBus network communicates with UMSN using the software that handles CEBus network protocol for house code are taught in the Abstract and columns 7-9. Requests for house number using protocol implies that the requests are automatically perform by the protocol software).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the program (Internet protocol software) automatically access the house code managing site (i.e. centralized server) once the serial number has been provided in the system of EP' 640, as modified in claim 2, since Mostafa et al. teaches that communication between the centralized server and the network controller are through Internet protocols and using Internet protocols in EP '640 to request house code is efficient and guarantee the maintenance of consistency since human error are eliminated.

Regarding claim 4, EP '640 and Mostafa et al. teach the method according to claim 1, as described above.

EP '640 further teach that the method comprises the step of the adapters disregarding the received packet if the two house codes are not in conformity as the result of comparison (page 5, lines 24-27: if the detector does not find any code element with the expected permutation/code then the signal are not accepted, i.e. disregarded).

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/10/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It appear that applicant's remarks on page 5 is meant to apply to claim 2 and not claim 3 of the original claims that was filed on 9/2/2004, which has been canceled and combined into claim 1 filed on 7/10/2007. It is treated as so in this response.

Applicant argues in substance that Applicant's method of receiving a house code assigned by the house code managing site is different than Mofasta's. Applicant argues Mofasta discloses that the utility host master node (UHMN) first selects a proposed house code address. Then the UHMN polls the networks linked to the BAN port to check if the first proposed house code address is already in use (column 8, lines 30-33). The examiner notes that the applicant's arguments are mute in respect to the prior disclosed references, because: First, Mofasta's disclosure on column 8, lines 30-33 is only one out of many exemplary methods that are utilized by Mofasta to illustrate how UHMN obtains/generates the house code to assign to the device. UHMN is the house code managing site not the device that is receiving the house code. Second, how the house management site generate house code for distribution is irrelevant to how the device receive house code from the house management site. Applicant's claim did not disclose how the house code are generated by the house code managing site, instead it only recites that an access is made to the house code managing site on the internet and receiving an own house code assigned from the house code managing site, which is taught by Mofasta on column 7, lines 67 and column 8, lines 1-10 where CEBus nodes

(device/adaptor) hail (request, ask) for their unique device address (house code), and the CEBus network(controller) obtain from the UHMN (house code manager) unique device address and assigned to the respective CEBus nodes (devices). Therefore, the combination of EP '640 and Mofasta teach all the limitation of amended claims.

***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yan Chen whose telephone number is (571) 270-1926. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Pwu can be reached on (571) 272-6798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

YC

Supervisory Patent Exmr.